

NONZERO-SUM RISK SENSITIVE STOCHASTIC GAMES FOR CONTINUOUS TIME MARKOV CHAINS

MRINAL K. GHOSH, K. SURESH KUMAR AND CHANDAN PAL

ABSTRACT. We study nonzero-sum stochastic games for continuous time Markov chains on a denumerable state space with risk sensitive discounted and ergodic cost criteria. For the discounted cost criterion we first show that the corresponding system of coupled HJB equations has an appropriate solution. Then under an additional additive structure on the transition rate matrix and payoff functions, we establish the existence of a Nash equilibrium in Markov strategies. For the ergodic cost criterion we assume a Lyapunov type stability assumption and a small cost condition. Under these assumptions we show that the corresponding system of coupled HJB equations admits a solution which leads to the existence of Nash equilibrium in stationary strategies.

Key words: Risk sensitive stochastic games, Continuous time Markov chains, Coupled HJB equations, Nash equilibrium, Stationary strategy, Eventually stationary strategy.

1. INTRODUCTION

We study nonzero-sum stochastic games on infinite time horizon for continuous time Markov chains on a denumerable state space. The performance evaluation criterion is exponential of integral cost which addresses the decision makers (i.e., players) attitude towards risk. In other words we address the problem of nonzero-sum risk sensitive stochastic games involving continuous time Markov chains. In the literature of stochastic games involving continuous time Markov chains, one usually studies the integral of the cost (see, e.g., Guo and Hernández-Lerma [16], [17], [18]) which is the so called risk-neutral situation. In the exponential of integral cost, the evaluation criterion is multiplicative as opposed to the additive nature of evaluation criterion in the integral of cost case. This difference makes the risk sensitive case significantly different from its risk neutral counterpart. The study of risk sensitive criterion was first introduced by Bellman in [2]; see Whittle [30] and the references therein. Though this criterion is studied extensively in the context of stochastic dynamic optimization both in discrete and continuous time (see, e.g., Cavazos-Cadena and Fernandez-Gaucherand [5], Di Masi and Stettner [6], [7], [8], Fleming and Hernández-Hernández [11], [12], Fleming

and McEneaney [13], Hernández-Hernández and Marcus [19], [20], Howard and Matheson [22], Jacobson [23], Rothblum [28]), the corresponding results for stochastic dynamic games are rather sparse. Notable exceptions are Basar [1], El-Karoui and Hamadene [9], James et al. [24], Klompstra [25]. Recently risk sensitive continuous time Markov decision processes has been studied by Ghosh and Saha [14], Kumar and Pal [26], [27]. In this paper we extend the results of the above three papers to the nonzero-sum stochastic games. In particular we establish the existence of a Nash equilibria for risk-sensitive discounted and long-run average (or ergodic) cost criteria.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 deals with the problem description and preliminaries. The discounted cost criterion is analyzed in Section 3. Here we first establish the existence of a solution to the corresponding coupled Hamilton-Jacobi- Bellman (HJB) equations. Then under certain additive structure on the transition rate (infinite) matrix and payoff functions, we establish the existence of a Nash equilibrium in Markov strategies. In Section 4, we turn our attention to the ergodic cost criterion. Under a Lyapunov type stability assumption and a small cost assumption, we carry out the vanishing discount asymptotics. This leads to the existence of appropriate solutions to the coupled HJB equations for the ergodic cost criterion. This in turn leads to the existence of a Nash equilibrium in stationary strategies. We conclude our paper in Section 5 with a few remarks.

2. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND PRELIMINARIES

For the sake of notational simplicity we treat two player game. The N -player game for $N \geq 3$ is analogous. Let $U_i, i = 1, 2$, be compact metric spaces and $V_i = \mathcal{P}(U_i)$, the space of probability measures on U_i with Prohorov topology. Let

$$U := U_1 \times U_2 \text{ and } V := V_1 \times V_2.$$

Let $\bar{\pi}_{ij} : U \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ for $i \neq j$ and $\bar{\pi}_{ii} : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $i \in S$. Define $\pi_{ij} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as follows: for $v := (v_1, v_2) \in V$,

$$\pi_{ij}(v_1, v_2) = \int_{U_2} \int_{U_1} \bar{\pi}_{ij}(u_1, u_2) v_1(du_1) v_2(du_2) := \int_U \bar{\pi}_{ij}(u) v(du),$$

where $u := (u_1, u_2) \in U$, $i, j \in S := \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Throughout this paper we assume that:

(A1) The transition rates $\bar{\pi}_{ij}(u) \geq 0$ for all $i \neq j$, $u \in U$ and the transition rates $\bar{\pi}_{ij}(u)$ are conservative, i.e.,

$$\sum_{j \in S} \bar{\pi}_{ij}(u) = 0 \text{ for } i \in S \text{ and } u \in U.$$

The functions $\bar{\pi}_{ij}$ are continuous and

$$\sup_{i \in S, u \in U} [-\bar{\pi}_{ii}(u)] := M < \infty.$$

We consider a continuous time controlled Markov chain $Y(t)$ with state space S and controlled rate matrix $\Pi_{v_1, v_2} = (\pi_{ij}(v_1, v_2))$, given by the stochastic integral

$$(2.1) \quad dY(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(Y(t-), v_1(t), v_2(t), z) \wp(dzdt).$$

Here $\wp(dzdt)$ is a Poisson random measure with intensity $dzdt$, where $dzdt$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty)$. The control process $v(\cdot) := (v_1(\cdot), v_2(\cdot))$ takes value in V , and $h : S \times V \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined as follows:

$$(2.2) \quad h(i, v, z) = \begin{cases} j - i & \text{if } z \in \Delta_{ij}(v) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $v := (v_1, v_2)$ and $\{\Delta_{ij}(v) : i \neq j, i, j \in S\}$ denotes intervals of the form $[a, b)$ with length of $\Delta_{ij}(v) = \pi_{ij}(v)$ which are pairwise disjoint for each fixed $v \in V$.

If $v_i(t) = \bar{v}_i(t, Y(t-))$ for some measurable map $\bar{v}_i : [0, \infty) \times S \rightarrow V_i$, then v_i is called a Markov strategy for the i th player. With an abuse of terminology, the map $\bar{v}_i$ itself is called a Markov strategy of player i . A Markov strategy v_i is called a stationary strategy if the map $\bar{v}_i$ does not have explicit dependence on time. We denote the set of all Markov strategies by $\mathcal{M}_i$ and the set of all stationary strategies by $\mathcal{S}_i$ for the i th player. The spaces $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are endowed with the product topology. Since V_1 and V_2 are compact, it follows that $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are compact as well.

The existence of a unique weak solution to the equation (2.1) for a pair of Markov strategies (v_1, v_2) for a given initial distribution $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ follows using the assumption (A1), see Guo and Hernández-Lerma [[15], Theorem 2.3, Theorem 2.5, pp.14-15].

We now list the commonly used notations below.

- $C_b([a, b] \times S)$ denotes the set of all functions $f : [a, b] \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\cdot, i) \in C_b[a, b]$, for each $i \in S$.
- $C^1((a, b) \times S)$ denotes the set of all functions $f : (a, b) \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $f(\cdot, i) \in C^1(a, b)$, for each $i \in S$.
- $C_c^\infty(a, b)$ denotes the set of all infinitely differentiable functions on (a, b) with compact support.
- For any $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $(v_1, v_2) \in V_1 \times V_2$, $\Pi_{v_1, v_2} f(i) = \sum_{j \in S} \pi_{ij}(v_1, v_2) f(j)$.

Set

$$B_W(S) = \{h : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid \sup_{i \in S} \frac{|h(i)|}{W(i)} < \infty\},$$

where W is the Lyapunov function as in (A3) (to be described in Section 4). Define for $h \in B_W(S)$,

$$\|h\|_W = \sup_{i \in S} \frac{|h(i)|}{W(i)}.$$

Then $B_W(S)$ is a Banach space with the norm $\|\cdot\|_W$.

For $k = 1, 2$, let $\bar{r}_k : S \times U_1 \times U_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be the running cost function for the k th player, i.e., when state of the system is i and the actions (u_1, u_2) are chosen by the players, then the k th player incurs a cost at the rate of $\bar{r}_k(i, u_1, u_2)$. Throughout this paper, we assume that the functions $\bar{r}_k$ are bounded and continuous. Each player wants to minimize his accumulated cost over his strategies. The time horizon is infinite and we consider two risk sensitive cost evaluation criteria, viz., discounted cost and ergodic cost criteria which we describe now.

2.1. Discounted cost criterion. Let $\theta_k \in (0, \Theta)$, for a fixed $\Theta > 0$, be the risk aversion parameter chosen by the k th player, $k = 1, 2$. For a pair of Markov strategies (v_1, v_2) , the α -discounted payoff criterion, for k th player is given by

$$(2.3) \quad \mathcal{J}_{\alpha, k}^{v_1, v_2}(\theta_k, i) := \frac{1}{\theta_k} \ln E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right], i \in S,$$

where $\alpha > 0$ is the discount parameter, $Y(t)$ is the Markov chain corresponding to $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ and $E_i^{v_1, v_2}$ denotes the expectation with respect to the law of the process $Y(t)$ with initial condition $Y(0) = i$, and $r_k : S \times V_1 \times V_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is given by

$$r_k(i, v_1, v_2) = \int_{U_2} \int_{U_1} \bar{r}_k(i, u_1, u_2) v_1(du_1) v_2(du_2).$$

Definition 2.1. For $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in (0, \Theta) \times (0, \Theta)$, a pair of strategies $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ is said to be a Nash equilibrium if

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_{\alpha, 1}^{v_1^*, v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) &\leq \mathcal{J}_{\alpha, 1}^{v_1, v_2^*}(\theta_1, i), \text{ for all } v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1 \text{ and } i \in S \\ \mathcal{J}_{\alpha, 2}^{v_1^*, v_2^*}(\theta_2, i) &\leq \mathcal{J}_{\alpha, 2}^{v_1^*, v_2}(\theta_2, i), \text{ for all } v_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2 \text{ and } i \in S. \end{aligned}$$

2.2. Ergodic Cost Criterion. For a pair of Markov strategies (v_1, v_2) , the risk-sensitive ergodic cost for player k is given by

$$(2.4) \quad \rho_k^{v_1, v_2}(\theta_k, i) := \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_k T} \ln E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

Definition 2.2. For $(\theta_1, \theta_2) \in (0, \Theta) \times (0, \Theta)$, a pair of strategies $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ is called a Nash equilibrium if

$$\rho_1^{v_1^*, v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \leq \rho_1^{v_1, v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \text{ for all } v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1 \text{ and } i \in S$$

and

$$\rho_2^{v_1^*, v_2^*}(\theta_2, i) \leq \rho_2^{v_1^*, v_2}(\theta_2, i) \text{ for all } v_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2 \text{ and } i \in S.$$

We wish to establish the existence of a Nash equilibrium in stationary strategies.

We now outline a procedure for establishing the existence of a Nash equilibrium. We treat the ergodic cost case for this purpose. The discounted cost case can be analyzed along similar lines. Suppose player 2 announces that he is going to employ a strategy $v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$. In such a scenario, player 1 attempts to minimize

$$\rho_1^{v_1, v_2}(\theta_1, i) = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_1 T} \ln E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right],$$

over $v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$. Thus for player 1 it is a continuous time Markov decision problem (CTMDP) with risk sensitive ergodic cost. This problem has been studied by Ghosh and Saha [14], Kumar and Pal [26], [27]. In particular under certain assumptions, it is shown by Kumar and Pal [26], [27] that the following Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman (HJB) equation

$$\begin{cases} \theta_1 \rho_1 \hat{\psi}_1(i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2(i)} \hat{\psi}_1(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2(i)) \hat{\psi}_1(i) \right] \\ \hat{\psi}_1(i_0) = 1, \end{cases}$$

has a suitable solution $(\rho_1, \hat{\psi}_1)$, where ρ_1 is a scalar and $\hat{\psi}_1 : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has suitable growth rate; i_0 is a fixed element of S . Furthermore it is shown by Kumar and Pal [26], [27] that

$$\rho_1 = \inf_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_1 T} \ln E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right],$$

and if $v_1^* \in \mathcal{S}_1$ is such that for $i \in S$

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2(i)} \hat{\psi}_1(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2(i)) \hat{\psi}_1(i) \right] \\ &= \Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2(i)} \hat{\psi}_1(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1^*(i), v_2(i)) \hat{\psi}_1(i), \end{aligned}$$

then $v_1^* \in \mathcal{S}_1$ is an optimal control for player 1, i.e., for any $i \in S$

$$\rho_1 = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_1 T} \ln E_i^{v_1^*, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(t-), v_1^*(Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

In other words given that player 2 is using the strategy $v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$, $v_1^* \in \mathcal{S}_1$ is an optimal response for player 1. Clearly v_1^* depends on v_2 and moreover there may be several optimal responses for player 1 in $\mathcal{S}_1$. Analogous results holds for player 2 if player 1 announces that he is going to use a strategy $v_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Hence given a pair of strategies $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, we can find a set of pairs of optimal responses $\{(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2\}$ via the appropriate pair of HJB equations described above. This defines a set-valued map. Clearly any fixed point of this set-valued map is a Nash equilibrium.

The above discussion leads to the following procedure for finding a pair of Nash equilibrium strategies for ergodic cost criterion. Suppose that there exist a pair of stationary strategies $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, a pair of scalars

(ρ_1^*, ρ_2^*) and a pair of functions $(\hat{\psi}_1^*, \hat{\psi}_2^*)$ with appropriate growth conditions, such that the coupled HJB equations given by

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta_1 \rho_1^* \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \\ \hat{\psi}_1^*(i_0) = 1, \\ \theta_2 \rho_2^* \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2} \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1^*(i), v_2) \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) \\ \hat{\psi}_2^*(i_0) = 1, \end{array} \right.$$

where as before $i_0 \in S$ is a fixed point, then it can be shown that (v_1^*, v_2^*) is a pair of Nash equilibrium and (ρ_1^*, ρ_2^*) is the pair of corresponding Nash values. An analogous coupled system of HJB equation for the discounted cost criterion can be derived along similar lines. We first solve the coupled HJB equations for the discounted cost criterion (to be describe in the next section). We then carry out the vanishing discount asymptotics to obtain an appropriate solution of the above coupled HJB equation for the ergodic cost criterion.

3. ANALYSIS OF DISCOUNTED COST CRITERION

We carry out our analysis of the discounted cost criterion via the criterion

$$(3.1) \quad J_{\alpha, k}^{v_1, v_2}(\theta_k, i) := E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_k(X(t), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

Since logarithmic is an increasing function, therefore any Nash equilibrium for the criterion (2.3) is Nash equilibrium for above criterion. To establish the existence of a Nash equilibrium for the discounted cost criterion, we first study the corresponding coupled HJB equations.

3.1. Coupled HJB Equations for the Discounted Case. Let $v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$ be an arbitrarily fixed strategy of the second player. Consider the CTMDP for player 1 with the α -discounted ($\alpha > 0$) risk-sensitive cost criterion

$$(3.2) \quad J_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i, v_1) = E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right],$$

where $Y(t)$ is the process (2.1) corresponding to $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ with initial condition $i \in S$.

We define the value function for the cost criterion (3.2) by

$$\psi_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} J_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i, v_1).$$

Then by the result of Ghosh and Saha [14], Kumar and Pal [26], $\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}$ is the unique solution in $C_b([0, \Theta] \times S) \cap C^1((0, \Theta) \times S)$ to

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) \right] \\ \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(0, i) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Similarly let player 1 fix a strategy $v_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and consider the CTMDP for player 2 with α -discounted risk-sensitive cost criterion

$$J_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i, v_2) = E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_2 \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_2(Y(t-), v_1(Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

Set

$$\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i) = \inf_{v_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2} J_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i, v_2).$$

Then, as before, $\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}$ is the unique solution in $C_b([0, \Theta] \times S) \cap C^1((0, \Theta) \times S)$ to

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{cases} \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_1(i), v_2} \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1(i), v_2) \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i) \right] \\ \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(0, i) = 1. \end{cases}$$

To proceed further we establish some technical results needed later.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume (A1). Then for each $\theta_k \in (0, \Theta)$, $k = 1, 2$, and $\alpha > 0$, $i \in S$*

$$1 \leq \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i) \leq e^{\frac{\theta_2 \|r_2\|_\infty}{\alpha}}, \text{ and } 1 \leq \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) \leq e^{\frac{\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}.$$

Also

$$\left\| \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}}{d\theta_2} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|r_2\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_2\|_\infty}{\alpha}}, \text{ and } \left\| \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}}{d\theta_1} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}},$$

where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the sup-norm.

Proof. Since

$$\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right],$$

it follows that

$$1 \leq \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) \leq e^{\frac{\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}, \quad \forall 0 < \theta_1 < \Theta, i \in S, 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

Similarly for $\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}$ we obtain

$$1 \leq \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i) \leq e^{\frac{\theta_2 \|r_2\|_\infty}{\alpha}}, \quad \forall 0 < \theta_2 < \Theta, i \in S, 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

For $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, $i \in S$, set

$$F_\alpha^1(i, v_1, v_2) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt$$

and

$$G_\alpha^1(\theta_1, i, v_1, v_2) = E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

It is easily seen that

$$\frac{dG_\alpha^1}{d\theta_1} = E_i^{v_1, v_2} [F_\alpha^1 e^{\theta_1 F_\alpha^1}] \leq \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}.$$

For each $\epsilon > 0$,

$$G_\alpha^1(\theta_1 + \epsilon, i, v_1, v_2) - G_\alpha^1(\theta_1, i, v_1, v_2) = \epsilon \frac{dG_\alpha^1}{d\theta_1}(\theta_\epsilon, i, v_1, v_2),$$

for some θ_ϵ which lies on the line segment joining θ_1 and $\theta_1 + \epsilon$. Therefore

$$|G_\alpha^1(\theta_1 + \epsilon, i, v_1, v_2) - G_\alpha^1(\theta_1, i, v_1, v_2)| \leq \epsilon \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1 + \epsilon, i) - \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i)| &\leq \sup_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} |G_\alpha^1(\theta_1 + \epsilon, i, v_1, v_2) - G_\alpha^1(\theta_1, i, v_1, v_2)| \\ &\leq \epsilon \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous bound can be proved if $\epsilon < 0$. Hence it follows that

$$\left\| \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}.$$

Using analogous arguments we can show that

$$\left\| \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|r_2\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_2\|_\infty}{\alpha}}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 3.2. *Assume (A1). Let $v_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$. Then the maps $v_2 \rightarrow \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}$ and $v_1 \rightarrow \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}$ are continuous.*

Proof. Let $v_2^m \rightarrow \hat{v}_2$ in $\mathcal{S}_2$, i.e., $v_2^m(i) \rightarrow \hat{v}_2(i)$ in V_2 for each $i \in S$. By Lemma 3.1, we have

$$1 \leq \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) \leq e^{\frac{\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) \leq \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}.$$

Thus by Arzela-Ascoli theorem there exists a function $\psi_{\alpha,1}$ in $C_b((0, \Theta] \times S)$ and a subsequence denoted by $\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}$ by an abuse of notation, such that $\{\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}\}$ converges uniformly to $\psi_{\alpha,1}$ over compact subset of $(0, \Theta) \times S$. Let $\varphi \in C_c^\infty(0, \Theta)$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} - \int_0^\Theta \alpha \frac{d(\theta_1 \varphi)}{d\theta_1} \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m} d\theta_1 &= \int_0^\Theta \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}}{d\theta_1} \varphi d\theta_1 \\ &= \int_0^\Theta \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2^m(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2^m(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) \right] \varphi d\theta_1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int_0^\Theta \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left\{ \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{\Pi}_{u_1, u_2} v_1(du_1) v_2^m(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) \right. \\
&+ \left. \theta_1 \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{r}_1(i, u_1, u_2) v_1(du_1) v_2^m(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) \right\} \varphi d\theta_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $m \rightarrow \infty$ along a suitable subsequence and using (A1), we get for each $i \in S$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&- \int_0^\Theta \alpha \frac{d(\theta_1 \varphi)}{d\theta_1} \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) d\theta_1 \\
&= \int_0^\Theta \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left\{ \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{\Pi}_{u_1, u_2} v_1(du_1) \hat{v}_2(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) \right. \\
&+ \left. \theta_1 \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{r}_1(i, u_1, u_2) v_1(du_1) \hat{v}_2(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) \right\} \varphi d\theta_1 \\
&= \int_0^\Theta \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, \hat{v}_2(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) \right] \varphi(\theta) d\theta_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore we have

$$\alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}}{d\theta_1} = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, \hat{v}_2(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) \right],$$

in the sense of distribution. Note that right hand side above is continuous. Therefore $\frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}}{d\theta} \in C((0, \Theta) \times S)$. Thus $\psi_{\alpha,1} \in C_b([0, \Theta] \times S) \cap C^1((0, \Theta) \times S)$ is a solution to

$$\begin{cases} \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, \hat{v}_2(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) \right] \\ \psi_{\alpha,1}(0, i) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, using Itô's formula, $\psi_{\alpha,1}$ admits the following representation

$$\psi_{\alpha,1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} E_i^{v_1, \hat{v}_2} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), \hat{v}_2(Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

Hence $\psi_{\alpha,1} = \psi_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}$. The continuity of $v_2 \rightarrow \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}$ follows. Similarly we can show that $v_1 \rightarrow \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_1}$ is continuous. This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 3.1. *Assume (A1). Then there exist $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ and a pair of functions which are bounded and continuously differentiable $(\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}, \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*})$*

satisfying the following coupled HJB equations

$$(3.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2^*(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2^*(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_1^*, v_2^*(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1^*, v_2^*(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \\ \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2^*}(0, i) = 1, \\ \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2} \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1^*(i), v_2) \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*}(\theta_2, i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2^*} \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1^*(i), v_2^*) \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*}(\theta_2, i) \\ \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1^*}(0, i) = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Proof. Let $v_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$. For $i \in S$, $v_1 \in V_1$, set

$$F_1(i, v_1, v_2(i)) = \Pi_{v_1, v_2(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}(\theta_1, i),$$

where $\psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_2}$ is the solution of the equation (3.3). Let

$$H(v_2) = \left\{ v_1^* \in \mathcal{S}_1 \mid F_1(i, v_1^*(i), v_2(i)) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} F_1(i, v_1, v_2(i)) \text{ for all } i \in S \right\}.$$

Obviously v_1^* depends on θ_1 and α . We suppress this dependence for notational simplicity. Then by a standard measurable selection theorem (see Beneš [3]), $H(v_2)$ is a non empty subset of $\mathcal{S}_1$. Clearly $H(v_2)$ is convex. It is easy to show that $H(v_2)$ is closed and hence compact.

Similarly for $i \in S$, $v_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $v_2 \in V_2$, set

$$F_2(i, v_1(i), v_2) = \Pi_{v_1(i), v_2} \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1(i), v_2) \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}(\theta_2, i),$$

where $\psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_1}$ is the solution of the equation (3.4). Let

$$H(v_1) = \left\{ v_2^* \in \mathcal{S}_2 \mid F_2(i, v_1(i), v_2^*(i)) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} F_2(i, v_1(i), v_2) \text{ for all } i \in S \right\}.$$

Then, as before, $H(v_1)$ is convex and compact.

Define

$$H(v_1, v_2) = H(v_2) \times H(v_1).$$

Then $H(v_1, v_2)$ is nonempty, convex, and compact subset of $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. Thus

$$(v_1, v_2) \rightarrow H(v_1, v_2)$$

defines a point to set map from $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ to $2^{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2}$. Next we want to show that this map is upper semicontinuous. Let $\{(v_1^m, v_2^m)\} \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ and $(v_1^m, v_2^m) \rightarrow (\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ in $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, i.e., for each $i \in S$, $(v_1^m(i), v_2^m(i)) \rightarrow (\hat{v}_1(i), \hat{v}_2(i))$ in $V_1 \times V_2$. Let $\bar{v}_1^m \in H(v_2^m)$. Then $\{\bar{v}_1^m\} \subset \mathcal{S}_1$. Since $\mathcal{S}_1$ is compact, it has a convergent subsequence, denoted by the same sequence with an abuse of notation, such that

$$\bar{v}_1^m \rightarrow \bar{v}_1 \text{ in } \mathcal{S}_1.$$

Then $(\bar{v}_1^m, v_2^m) \rightarrow (\bar{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ in $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. Now using Lemmata 3.1 and 3.2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
F_1(i, \bar{v}_1(i), \hat{v}_2(i)) &= \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{\Pi}_{u_1, u_2} \bar{v}_1(i)(du_1) \hat{v}_2(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha, 1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) \\
&+ \theta_1 \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{r}_1(i, u_1, u_2) \bar{v}_1(i)(du_1) \hat{v}_2(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha, 1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) \\
&= \sum_{j \in S} \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{\pi}_{ij}(u_1, u_2) \psi_{\alpha, 1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, j) \bar{v}_1(i)(du_1) \hat{v}_2(i)(du_2) \\
&+ \theta_1 \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{r}_1(i, u_1, u_2) \bar{v}_1(i)(du_1) \hat{v}_2(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha, 1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) \\
&= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{j \in S} \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{\pi}_{ij}(u_1, u_2) \psi_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, j) \bar{v}_1^m(i)(du_1) v_2^m(i)(du_2) \\
&+ \theta_1 \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \int_{U_1} \int_{U_2} \bar{r}_1(i, u_1, u_2) \bar{v}_1^m(i)(du_1) v_2^m(i)(du_2) \psi_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) \\
(3.6) \quad &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} F_1(i, \bar{v}_1^m(i), v_2^m(i)).
\end{aligned}$$

Now fix $\tilde{v}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and consider the sequence $(\tilde{v}_1, v_2^m)$. Repeat the above argument to conclude that

$$(3.7) \quad F_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(i), \hat{v}_2(i)) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} F_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(i), v_2^m(i)).$$

Using the fact $\bar{v}_1^m \in H(v_2^m)$, we have

$$F_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(i), v_2^m(i)) \geq F_1(i, \bar{v}_1^m(i), v_2^m(i)) \text{ for all } m.$$

Thus

$$F_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(i), \hat{v}_2(i)) \geq F_1(i, \bar{v}_1(i), \hat{v}_2(i)) \text{ for all } \tilde{v}_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1.$$

Therefore $\bar{v}_1 \in H(\hat{v}_2)$. Let $\bar{v}_2^m \in H(v_1^m)$ and along a subsequence

$$\bar{v}_2^m \rightarrow \bar{v}_2 \text{ in } \mathcal{S}_2.$$

Using analogous arguments, we obtain $\bar{v}_2 \in H(\hat{v}_1)$. The upper semicontinuity of the map

$$(v_1, v_2) \rightarrow H(v_1, v_2)$$

follows. By Fan's fixed point theorem [10], there exists $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ such that $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in H(v_1^*, v_2^*)$. This establishes that there exist $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ and $(\psi_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^*}, \psi_{\alpha, 2}^{v_1^*})$ satisfy the coupled HJB equations (3.5). $\square$

Remark 3.1. (i) Note that v_1^* and v_2^* depend on θ_1 and θ_2 respectively. Hence $\psi_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^*}$ (resp. $\psi_{\alpha, 2}^{v_1^*}$) depend both on θ_1 and θ_2 . Thus for each θ_2 , $\psi_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^*}$ is continuously differentiable with respect to θ_1 and for each θ_1 , $\psi_{\alpha, 2}^{v_1^*}$ is continuously differentiable with respect to θ_2 . We have suppressed this dependence on θ_2 (resp. on θ_1) for notational convenience.

(ii) Note that for the discounted cost criterion the corresponding coupled HJB equations are given by (3.5). However, the pair of stationary strategies

(v_1^*, v_2^*) does not constitute a Nash equilibrium for this criterion. If player 1 announces his strategy v_1^* then the optimal response for player 2 for the discounted criterion is given by the Markov strategy $v_2^*(\theta_2 e^{-\alpha t}, i)$. An analogous statement holds for optimal response of player 1. Thus the existence of a pair of Nash equilibrium in Markov strategies for the discounted cost criterion needs further analysis which we carry out in the next subsection.

3.2. Existence of Nash Equilibrium for Discounted Cost Criterion.

In this subsection we establish the existence of a Nash equilibrium under the following additive structure on $\bar{\pi}_{u_1, u_2}$ and $\bar{r}_k(i, u_1, u_2)$.

(A2) We assume that $\bar{\pi}_{ij} : U_1 \times U_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\bar{r}_k : S \times U_1 \times U_2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $k = 1, 2$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\pi}_{ij}(u_1, u_2) &= \bar{\pi}_{ij}^1(u_1) + \bar{\pi}_{ij}^2(u_2), \\ \bar{r}_k(i, u_1, u_2) &= \bar{r}_{k1}(i, u_1) + \bar{r}_{k2}(i, u_2), i \in S, u_1 \in U_1, u_2 \in U_2, k = 1, 2,\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{\pi}_{ij}^k : U_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ assumed to be continuous;

$$\sup_{i, j \in S, u \in U} |\bar{\pi}_{ij}^k(u)| := M < \infty.$$

$\bar{r}_{kl} : S \times U_l \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $k, l = 1, 2$, assumed to be bounded and continuous.

These type of additive structure are rather standard in non-zero sum stochastic differential games (see, e.g., Borkar and Ghosh [4]) and non-zero sum stochastic games on an uncountable state space by Himmelberg et al. [21]. In fact in stochastic games these conditions are referred to as ARAT (additive reward, additive transition).

Now we define a class of strategies to be referred to as eventually stationary strategies denoted by $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$, $k = 1, 2$. Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k = \{\hat{v}_k : (0, \Theta) \times S \rightarrow V_k \mid \hat{v}_k(\cdot, i) \text{ is measurable for each } i \in S\}, k = 1, 2.$$

Note that as opposed to $\mathcal{S}_k$, the topology of pointwise convergence on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ is not metrizable. Thus we endow the space $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ with the weak* topology on $L^\infty((0, \Theta) \times S, \mathcal{M}_s(U_k))$, $k = 1, 2$, introduced by Warga [29] for the topology of relaxed controls, where $\mathcal{M}_s(U_k)$ is the space of all finite signed measure on U_k endowed with the topology of weak convergence. Note that with the above topology, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ becomes a compact metrizable space with following convergence criterion:

For $k = 1, 2$, $\hat{v}_k^n \rightarrow \hat{v}_k$ in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if and only if for each $i \in S$

$$(3.8) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\Theta f(\theta) \int_{U_k} g(\theta, u_k) \hat{v}_k^n(\theta, i) (du_k) d\theta = \int_0^\Theta f(\theta) \int_{U_k} g(\theta, u_k) \hat{v}_k(\theta, i) (du_k) d\theta,$$

for all $f \in L^1(0, \Theta) \cap L^2(0, \Theta) = L^2(0, \Theta)$, $g \in C_b((0, \Theta) \times U_k)$. The Markov strategies associated with $\hat{v}_k \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$, $k = 1, 2$ is given by $\hat{v}_k(\theta e^{-\alpha t}, Y(t-))$, $t \geq$

0 for each $\theta \in (0, \Theta)$ and $\alpha > 0$, where $Y(t)$ is the solution of the equation

$$(3.9) \quad dY(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} h(Y(t-), \hat{v}_1(\theta e^{-\alpha t}, Y(t-)), \hat{v}_2(\theta e^{-\alpha t}, Y(t-)), z) \wp(dz dt).$$

By an abuse of notation, we represent the eventually stationary Markov strategies by elements of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ though each member in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ corresponds to a family of Markov strategies indexed by θ and α . Note that as $t \rightarrow \infty$, $e^{-\alpha t} \rightarrow 0$. Thus in the long run an element of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$ “eventually” becomes an element of $\mathcal{S}_k$. Hence the terminology.

Define for $\hat{v}_k \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_k$, $k = 1, 2$

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) &= \inf_{\hat{v}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} J_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i), \quad \theta_1 \in (0, \Theta), \quad i \in S \\ \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}(\theta_2, i) &= \inf_{\hat{v}_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2} J_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2}(\theta_2, i), \quad \theta_2 \in (0, \Theta), \quad i \in S. \end{aligned}$$

By using similar arguments as in previous subsection it follows that $\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}$ is a bounded and absolutely continuous function satisfying the the following equation

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) \right] \\ \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(0, i) = 1, \end{cases}$$

and $\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}$ is a bounded and absolutely continuous function satisfying the the following equation

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{\hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), v_2} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, \hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), v_2) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}(\theta_2, i) \right] \\ \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}(0, i) = 1. \end{cases}$$

As before we can establish the following result, we omit the details.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume (A1). Then for $\theta \in (0, \Theta)$ and $\alpha > 0$ and $\hat{v}_k \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_k, k = 1, 2$, we have*

$$(3.13) \quad 1 \leq \max\{\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta, i), \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}(\theta, i)\} \leq \max_{k=1,2} \{e^{\frac{\theta \|r_k\|_{\infty}}{\alpha}}\},$$

$$\max\{\|\frac{d\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}}{d\theta}\|_{\infty}, \|\frac{d\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}}{d\theta}\|_{\infty}\} \leq \max_{k=1,2} \{\frac{\|r_k\|_{\infty}}{\alpha} e^{\frac{\Theta \|r_k\|_{\infty}}{\alpha}}\}.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Assume (A1). Then the maps $\hat{v}_1 \mapsto \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1}$ from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \rightarrow C^1([0, \Theta] \times S)$ and $\hat{v}_2 \mapsto \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}$ from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_2 \rightarrow C^1([0, \Theta] \times S)$ are continuous.*

Let $\hat{v}_2 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$. For $i \in S$, $v_1 \in V_1$ and $\theta_1 \in (0, \Theta)$, set

$$\tilde{F}_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) = \Pi_{v_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i).$$

Let

$$\tilde{H}(\hat{v}_2) = \left\{ \hat{v}_1^* \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \mid \tilde{F}_1(i, \hat{v}_1^*(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \tilde{F}_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) \text{ for all } i \in S \right\}.$$

Similarly for $i \in S$, $\hat{v}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$, $v_2 \in V_2$, $\theta_2 \in (0, \Theta)$, set

$$\tilde{F}_2(i, \hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), v_2) = \Pi_{\hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), v_2} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha, 2}^{\hat{v}_1}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, \hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), v_2) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha, 2}^{\hat{v}_1}(\theta_2, i),$$

and

$$\tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1) = \left\{ \hat{v}_2^* \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2 \mid \tilde{F}_2(i, \hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_2, i)) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \tilde{F}_2(i, \hat{v}_1(\theta_2, i), v_2) \text{ for all } i \in S \right\}.$$

Define

$$\tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) = \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_2) \times \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1).$$

Then using arguments as in Theorem 3.1, it follows that $\tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ is nonempty, convex, and compact subset of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$. Therefore $(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) \mapsto \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ defines a map from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2 \rightarrow 2^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1} \times 2^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_2}$. Now we establish the following result.

Lemma 3.5. *Assume (A1) and (A2). Then the map $(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) \mapsto \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ is upper semicontinuous.*

Proof. Let $\{(v_1^m, v_2^m)\} \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$ and $(v_1^m, v_2^m) \rightarrow (\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$. Let $\bar{v}_1^m \in \tilde{H}(v_2^m)$. Then $\bar{v}_1^m \subset \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$. Since $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$ is compact, it has a convergent subsequence, denoted by the same sequence with an abuse of notation, such that

$$\bar{v}_1^m \rightarrow \bar{v}_1 \text{ in } \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1.$$

Then $(\bar{v}_1^m, v_2^m) \rightarrow (\bar{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$. Now using (A2), Lemmata 3.3 and 3.4, and the topology of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_k, k = 1, 2$ it follows that for each $i \in S$

$$\Pi_{\bar{v}_1^m, v_2^m(\theta_1, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, \bar{v}_1^m, v_2^m(\theta_1, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha, 1}^{v_2^m}(\theta_1, i)$$

converges weakly in $L^2(0, \Theta)$ to

$$\Pi_{\bar{v}_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha, 1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, \bar{v}_1, \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha, 1}^{\hat{v}_2}(\theta_1, i).$$

Thus, by Banach-Saks theorem any sequence of convex combination of the former converges strongly in $L^2(0, \Theta)$ to the latter. Hence along a suitable subsequence

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}_1(i, \bar{v}_1^m(\theta_1, i), v_2^m(\theta_1, i)) = \tilde{F}_1(i, \bar{v}_1(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)), \text{ a.e. in } \theta_1.$$

Now fix $\tilde{v}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$ and consider the sequence $(\tilde{v}_1, v_2^m)$. Repeat the above argument to conclude that

$$\tilde{F}_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{F}_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(\theta_1, i), v_2^m(\theta_1, i)), \text{ a.e. in } \theta_1.$$

Using the fact $\bar{v}_1^m \in H(v_2^m)$, for any m we have

$$\tilde{F}_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(\theta_1, i), v_2^m(\theta_1, i)) \geq \tilde{F}_1(i, \bar{v}_1^m(\theta_1, i), v_2^m(\theta_1, i)), \text{ a.e. in } \theta_1.$$

Thus for any $\tilde{v}_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1$

$$\tilde{F}_1(i, \tilde{v}_1(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)) \geq \tilde{F}_1(i, \bar{v}_1(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2(\theta_1, i)), \text{ a.e. in } \theta_1.$$

Therefore $\bar{v}_1 \in \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_2)$. Let $\bar{v}_2^m \in \tilde{H}(\bar{v}_1^m)$ and along a subsequence

$$\bar{v}_2^m \rightarrow \bar{v}_2 \text{ in } \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2.$$

Using analogous arguments, we obtain $\bar{v}_2 \in \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1)$. This prove that the map

$$(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) \mapsto \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$$

is upper semicontinuous. $\square$

Theorem 3.2. *Assume (A1) and (A2). There exists α -discounted Nash equilibrium in the class $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$.*

Proof. From Lemma 3.5 and Fan's fixed point theorem [10], there exists a fixed point $(\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2$, for the map $(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2) \mapsto \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1, \hat{v}_2)$ from $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1 \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_2 \rightarrow 2^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_1} \times 2^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_2}$, i.e.,

$$(\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*) \in \tilde{H}(\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*).$$

This implies that $(\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}, \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*})$ satisfies the following coupled HJB equations (3.14)

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_1, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_1, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{\hat{v}_1^*(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_1, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, \hat{v}_1^*(\theta_1, i), \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_1, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \\ \quad \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}(0, i) = 1, \\ \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{\hat{v}_1^*(\theta_2, i), v_2} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, \hat{v}_1^*(\theta_2, i), v_2) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}(\theta_2, i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{\hat{v}_1^*(\theta_2, i), \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_2, i)} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, \hat{v}_1^*(\theta_2, i), \hat{v}_2^*(\theta_2, i)) \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}(\theta_2, i) \\ \quad \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}(0, i) = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Now from (3.10), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) &= \inf_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} J_{\alpha,1}^{v_1, \hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) \\ &= J_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i), \\ \tilde{\psi}_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*}(\theta_2, i) &= \inf_{v_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2} J_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*, v_2}(\theta_2, i) \\ &= J_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_2, i). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} J_{\alpha,1}^{v_1, \hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i) &\geq J_{\alpha,1}^{\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_1, i), \quad \forall v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1, \\ J_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*, v_2}(\theta_2, i) &\geq J_{\alpha,2}^{\hat{v}_1^*, \hat{v}_2^*}(\theta_2, i), \quad \forall v_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the existence of α -discounted Nash equilibrium which is eventually stationary Markov strategies. $\square$

4. VANISHING DISCOUNT ASYMPTOTICS

In this section we prove the existence of Nash equilibrium strategies for the ergodic cost criterion in the class of stationary Markov strategies under the following assumption:

(A3) (Lyapunov condition) There exist constants $b > 0$, $\delta > 0$, a finite set C and a map $W : S \rightarrow [1, \infty)$ with $W(i) \rightarrow \infty$ as $i \rightarrow \infty$, such that

$$\Pi_v W(i) \leq -2\delta W(i) + bI_C(i), \quad i \in S, \quad v \in V.$$

We refer to Guo and Hernández-Lerma [15] for examples of controlled continuous time Markov chains satisfying the above condition.

Throughout this section, we assume that for every pair of stationary Markov strategies (v_1, v_2) the corresponding Markov chain is irreducible. First we truncate our cost functions: This process plays a crucial role in finding a Nash equilibrium of the game. For $k = 1, 2$, let $r_k^n : S \times V \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be given by

$$(4.1) \quad r_k^n := \begin{cases} r_k & \text{if } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then as in the previous section we can show the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Assume (A1). Then there exist a pair of Markov stationary strategy $(v_{1,n}^*, v_{2,n}^*)$ and a pair of bounded, continuously differentiable functions $(\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}, \psi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*})$ such that*

$$(4.2) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_{1,n}^*, v_{2,n}^*(i)} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*(i)) \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i), \\ \quad \psi_{\alpha,1}^{v_{2,n}^*}(0, i) = 1, \\ \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2} \psi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2) \psi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*} \psi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*(i)) \psi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i), \\ \quad \psi_{\alpha,2}^{v_{1,n}^*}(0, i) = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Let

$$(4.3) \quad \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) := \frac{1}{\theta_1} \ln \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i).$$

Then

$$\alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1} = \theta_1 \left(\alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} + \theta_1 \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1} \right) \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}.$$

Let $\theta_1 \left(\alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} + \theta_1 \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1} \right) = g_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)$. Then $\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}$ is a solution to the ODE

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_{2,n}^*}(i) \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} + (\theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)) - g_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)) \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} \right] \\ \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(0, i) = 1. \end{cases}$$

In what follows we fix a reference state $i_0 \in S$ satisfying

$$W(i_0) \geq 1 + \frac{b}{\delta}.$$

Set

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) = \frac{\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)}{\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0)}.$$

Then a straightforward calculation shows that $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}$ is a solution to the ODE

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_{2,n}^*}(i) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} + (\theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)) - g_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} \right] \\ \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Using analogous arguments we can show that $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}$ is a solution to the ODE

$$\begin{cases} 0 = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^*, v_2}(i) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*} + (\theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2) - g_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*} \right] \\ \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i_0) = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\text{where } \theta_2 \left(\alpha \phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*} + \theta_2 \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}}{d\theta_2} \right) = g_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i).$$

This immediately yields the following result:

Theorem 4.2. *Assume (A1). Then there exist a pair of Markov stationary strategy $(v_{1,n}^*, v_{2,n}^*)$ and a pair of bounded, continuously differentiable*

functions $(\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}, \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*})$ such that

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} 0 = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_{2,n}^*}(i) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} + (\theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)) - g_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*} \right] \\ \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0) = 1, \\ 0 = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*} + (\theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2) - g_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*} \right] \\ \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i_0) = 1. \end{cases}$$

Next we want to take limit $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. To this end we show that $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)$, $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i)$ and $g_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)$, $g_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i)$ are uniformly bounded in α for each $i \in S$.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume (A1). Let $\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}$, $\phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}$ be given by (4.3), then the following inequalities hold:*

$$\|\alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}\|_\infty + \left\| \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1} \right\|_\infty \leq 3\|r_1\|_\infty, \quad \forall 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad 0 < \theta < \Theta.$$

and

$$\|\alpha \phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}\|_\infty + \left\| \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}}{d\theta_2} \right\|_\infty \leq 3\|r_2\|_\infty, \quad \forall 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad 0 < \theta < \Theta.$$

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$1 \leq \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \leq e^{\frac{\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}}, \quad \forall 0 < \theta_1 < \Theta, i \in S, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

Therefore

$$\|\alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}\|_\infty \leq \|r_1\|_\infty, \quad \forall 0 < \theta_1 < \Theta, i \in S, \quad 0 < \alpha < 1.$$

For $(v_1, v_{2,n}^*) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, $i \in S$, set

$$F_\alpha^{1n}(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*) = \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1^n(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(t-))) dt$$

and

$$H_\alpha^{1n}(\theta_1, i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*) = \log E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\infty e^{-\alpha t} r_1^n(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(t-))) dt} \right].$$

Then we have

$$\frac{dH_\alpha^{1n}}{d\theta_1} = \frac{1}{E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} [e^{\theta_1 F_\alpha^{1n}}]} E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} [F_\alpha^{1n} e^{\theta_1 F_\alpha^{1n}}] \leq \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}.$$

Using analogous arguments as in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we can show that for each $\epsilon > 0$,

$$|(\theta_1 + \epsilon) \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 + \epsilon, i) - \theta_1 \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)| \leq \sup_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} |H_\alpha^{1n}(\theta_1 + \epsilon, i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*) - H_\alpha^{1n}(\theta_1, i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*)|$$

$$\leq \epsilon \frac{\|r_1\|_\infty}{\alpha}.$$

Analogous bound can be obtained for $\epsilon < 0$. Therefore we have

$$\left\| \alpha \frac{d(\theta_1 \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*})}{d\theta_1} \right\|_\infty \leq \|r_1\|_\infty.$$

Note that

$$\left\| \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1} \right\|_\infty \leq \left\| \alpha \frac{d(\theta_1 \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*})}{d\theta_1} \right\|_\infty + \|\alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}\|_\infty.$$

Hence

$$\|\alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}\|_\infty + \left\| \alpha \theta_1 \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1} \right\|_\infty \leq 3\|r_1\|_\infty, \quad \forall 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad 0 < \theta < \Theta.$$

Using analogous arguments we can show that

$$\|\alpha \phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}\|_\infty + \left\| \alpha \theta_2 \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}}{d\theta_2} \right\|_\infty \leq 3\|r_2\|_\infty, \quad \forall 0 < \alpha < 1, \quad 0 < \theta < \Theta.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Form the Lemma 4.1, it is clear that $g_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)$, $g_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i)$ are uniformly bounded. For each $i \in S$, we want to show that $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)$, $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i)$ are uniformly (in α) bounded.

We need the following result which is proved by Kumar and Pal [[26], Theorem 3.1].

Theorem 4.3. Assume (A1). For any set $\tilde{S} \subseteq S$,

$$\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \leq \inf_{v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1} E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\tau e^{-\alpha s} r_1^n(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, Y(\tau)) \right],$$

where τ is the hitting time of the process $Y(t)$ corresponding to $(v_1, v_{2,n}^*) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ to the set $\tilde{S}$.

Lemma 4.2. Assume (A1) and (A3). Let $Y(t)$ be the process (2.1) corresponding to $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ and let $C_0 = \{j \in S : W(j) \geq 1 + \frac{b}{\delta}\}$. Then for each $j \in C_0$

$$E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\delta \tau_j} \right] \leq W(i),$$

where $\tau_j = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y(t) = j\}$.

Proof. Applying Itô-Dynkin's formula to $f(t) = e^{\delta t} W(Y(t))$, and using (A3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E_i^{v_1, v_2} [f(\tau_j \wedge \tau_N) - W(i)] \\ &= E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[\int_0^{\tau_j \wedge \tau_N} e^{\delta s} [\Pi_{v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2(s, Y(s-))} W(Y(s)) + \delta W(Y(s))] ds \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[\int_0^{\tau_j \wedge \tau_N} e^{\delta s} (-\delta W(Y(s)) + bI_C(Y(s))) ds \right] \\
&\leq \left(\frac{b}{\delta} - 1 \right) E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\delta(\tau_j \wedge \tau_N)} \right] \leq \frac{b}{\delta} E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\delta \tau_j} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_N = \inf\{t \geq 0 | Y(t) \notin \{1, 2, \dots, N\}\}$. Hence

$$E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\delta(\tau_j \wedge \tau_N)} W(Y(\tau_j \wedge \tau_N))] \leq W(i) + \frac{b}{\delta} E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\delta \tau_j}].$$

By letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ and invoking Fatou's lemma, we obtain

$$E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\delta \tau_j} W(Y(\tau_j))] \leq W(i) + \frac{b}{\delta} E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\delta \tau_j}].$$

Therefore,

$$E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\delta \tau_j} (W(j) - \frac{b}{\delta})] \leq W(i).$$

Since $W(j) \geq 1 + \frac{b}{\delta}$, we get

$$E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\delta \tau_j}] \leq W(i).$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Before proceeding further we make the following small cost assumption.

(A4) $\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty \leq \delta$ and $\theta_2 \|r_2\|_\infty \leq \delta$, where $\delta > 0$ is as in (A3).

Lemma 4.3. *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Let $Y(t)$ be the process (2.1) corresponding to $(v_1, v_2) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{M}_2$. Then for $k = 1, 2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) ds} W(Y(T))] \\
&\leq (W(i) + bT) E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) ds} \right], T \in [0, \infty).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Applying Itô-Dynkin's formula to

$$g(t) = e^{\theta_k \int_0^t r_k(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2(s, Y(s-))) ds} W(Y(t)),$$

and using (A3) and (A4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_i^{v_1, v_2} [g(T \wedge \tau_N) - W(i)] \\
&= E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N} e^{\theta_k \int_0^s r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \left[\Pi_{v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2(s, Y(s-))} W(Y(s)) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \theta_k r_k(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2(s, Y(s-))) W(Y(s)) \right] ds \right] \\
&\leq E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N} e^{\theta_k \int_0^s r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left[\Pi_{v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2(s, Y(s-))} W(Y(s)) + \delta W(Y(s)) \right] ds \right] \\
&\leq E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[\int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N} e^{\theta_k \int_0^s r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} (-\delta W(Y(s)) + bI_C(Y(s))) ds \right] \\
&\leq bT E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_N = \inf\{t \geq 0 | Y(t) \notin \{1, 2, \dots, N\}\}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\theta_k \int_0^{T \wedge \tau_N} r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} W(Y(T \wedge \tau_N))] \\ & \leq W(i) + bT E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

By letting $N \rightarrow \infty$ and invoking Fatou's lemma, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E_i^{v_1, v_2} [e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} W(Y(T))] \\ & \leq (W(i) + bT) E_i^{v_1, v_2} \left[e^{\theta_k \int_0^T r_k(Y(t-), v_1(t, Y(t-)), v_2(t, Y(t-))) dt} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.4. *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then*

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \leq W(i), \quad i \in S$$

and

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) \leq W(i), \quad i \in S.$$

Proof. From Theorem 4.3, we have for $\hat{v}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \\ & \leq E_i^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_{i_0}} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, Y(\tau_{i_0})) \right] \\ & = E_i^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_{i_0}} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, i_0) \right] \\ & \leq E_i^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_{i_0}} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_{i_0} = \inf\{t \geq 0 | Y(t) = i_0\}$. In the last inequality we used the fact that $\psi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\cdot, i)$ is nondecreasing in θ_1 for each fixed i . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\psi}_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \\ & \leq E_i^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_{i_0}} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right] \\ & \leq E_i^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} e^{\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty \tau_{i_0}} \leq W(i). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Lemma 4.2. Using analogous arguments we can show that

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) \leq W(i), \quad i \in S.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.5. *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then*

$$\sup_{\alpha > 0, i \in S} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) < \infty$$

and

$$\sup_{\alpha > 0, i \in S} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) < \infty.$$

Proof. Let $i \geq n+1$ and let $Y(t)$ be the solution corresponding to $(v_1, v_{2,n}^*) \in \mathcal{M}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ with initial condition i . Then from Theorem 4.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \\ \leq & E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^\tau e^{-\alpha s} r_1^n(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, Y(\tau)) \right] \\ \leq & E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, Y(\tau)) \right] \\ \leq & E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, Y(\tau)) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tau = \inf\{t \geq 0 : Y(t) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}\}.$$

In the last inequality we used the fact that $\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\cdot, i)$ is nondecreasing in θ_1 for each fixed i . Hence

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \leq 1 + \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, j) \leq 1 + \max_{j=1, \dots, n} W(j).$$

since $\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0) \geq 1$ and last inequality follows from Lemma 4.4. Therefore for each $n \geq 1$, $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}$ is bounded. Similarly we can prove that for each $n \geq 1$, $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}$ is bounded. This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 4.6. Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \geq \frac{1}{W(i_0)}, \quad i \in C_0$$

and

$$\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) \geq \frac{1}{W(i_0)}, \quad i \in C_0,$$

where C_0 is as in Lemma 4.2.

Proof. From Theorem 4.3, we have for $\hat{v}_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0) \\ \leq & E_{i_0}^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_i} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, Y(\tau_i)) \right] \\ = & E_{i_0}^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_i} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1 e^{-\alpha \tau}, i) \right] \\ \leq & E_{i_0}^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_i} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\tau_i = \inf\{t \geq 0 | Y(t) = i\}$. In the last inequality we used the fact that $\psi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\cdot, i)$ is nondecreasing in θ_1 . Hence for $i \in C_0$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)} & \leq E_{i_0}^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^{\tau_i} e^{-\alpha s} r_1(Y(s-), \hat{v}_1((s, Y(s-))), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right] \\ & \leq E_{i_0}^{\hat{v}_1, v_{2,n}^*} e^{\theta_1 \|r_1\|_\infty \tau_i} \leq W(i_0). \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from Lemma 4.2. Using analogous arguments we obtain the other bound. This completes the proof. $\square$

Theorem 4.4. *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then there exist a pair of stationary Markov strategies $(v_{1,n}^*, v_{2,n}^*)$, a pair of scalars $(\rho_{1n}^*, \rho_{2n}^*)$ and a pair of functions $(\hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i), \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i))$ in $B_W(S) \times B_W(S)$ such that*

$$(4.5) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta_1 \rho_{1n}^* \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) + \theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) + \theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) \\ \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i_0) = 1, \\ \theta_2 \rho_{2n}^* \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2} \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i) + \theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_2) \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i) + \theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^*(i), v_{2,n}^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i) \\ \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i_0) = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Moreover, $\sup_n \{\rho_{1n}^*, \rho_{2n}^*\} \leq \delta$.

Proof. Using Lemma 4.4, for each fix i , $\{\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) | \alpha > 0\}$ and $\{\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) | \alpha > 0\}$ are bounded. Hence along a subsequence, denoted by the same notation with an abuse of notation, we have $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \rightarrow \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i)$ and $\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) \rightarrow \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i)$ for each $i \in S$ for some $\hat{\psi}_{kn}^* : S \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, $k = 1, 2$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 4.4, $\hat{\psi}_{kn}^* \in B_W(S)$ for $k = 1, 2$. By Lemma 4.1 it follows that along a further subsequence

$$(4.6) \quad \alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \rightarrow \varrho_{1n}^*(\theta_1, i),$$

for each $\theta_1 > 0$ and $i \in S$. From Lemmata 4.4 and 4.6, we have

$$W(i) \geq \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) \geq \frac{1}{W(i_0)} \wedge \min_{i \in C_0^c} \{\bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i)\}, \quad i \in S.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) &= \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \alpha \left(\frac{1}{\theta_1} \ln \bar{\psi}_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) + \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0) \right), \\ &= \lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \alpha \phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i_0). \end{aligned}$$

Hence ϱ_{1n}^* is a function of θ_1 alone. Also by Lemma 4.1, $\left\{ \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) \mid \alpha > 0 \right\}$ is bounded for each i . Hence along a further subsequence

$$(4.7) \quad \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha,1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) \rightarrow \varrho_{2n}^*(\theta_1, i).$$

It follows from (4.6) and (4.7) that $\varrho_{2n}^*(\cdot, \cdot) = (\varrho_{1n}^*)'$ in the sense of distribution, where $(\varrho_{1n}^*)'$ is the distributional derivative (in θ_1) of ϱ_{1n}^* . Hence

$\rho_{2n}^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ is also a function of θ_1 alone. Thus we have: for each $\theta_1 > 0$, there exists a constant ρ_{1n}^* such that along a suitable subsequence

$$\theta_1 \left(\alpha \phi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}(\theta_1, i) + \theta_1 \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^*}}{d\theta_1}(\theta_1, i) \right) \rightarrow \rho_{1n}^*, \quad i \in S.$$

Using analogous arguments, we have along a suitable subsequence

$$\theta_2 \left(\alpha \phi_{\alpha, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}(\theta_2, i) + \theta_2 \alpha \frac{d\phi_{\alpha, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^*}}{d\theta_2}(\theta_2, i) \right) \rightarrow \rho_{2n}^*, \quad i \in S,$$

where ρ_{2n}^* is a constant.

Let all sequences above converge along a common subsequence α_m . From Theorem 4.2, there exists a pair of Markov stationary strategies $(v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}, v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m})$

and a pair of bounded, absolutely continuous functions $(\bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}}, \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}})$ such that

$$(4.8) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}(i)} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}} + (\theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_1, v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}(i)) - g_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}}(\theta_1, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}} \right] \\ \quad = \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}, v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}(i)} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}} + (\theta_1 r_1^n(i, v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}, v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}(i)) - g_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}}(\theta_1, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}} \right] \\ \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 1n}^{v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}}(\theta_1, i_0) = 1, \\ 0 = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}(i), v_2} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}} + (\theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}(i), v_2) - g_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}}(\theta_2, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}} \right] \\ \quad = \left[\Pi_{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}(i), v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}(i)} \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}} + (\theta_2 r_2^n(i, v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}(i), v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m}(i)) - g_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}}(\theta_2, i)) \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}} \right] \\ \bar{\psi}_{\alpha_m, 2n}^{v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m}}(\theta_2, i_0) = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Since $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are compact, therefore along a subsequence denoted by the same subsequence α_m , we have $v_{1,n}^{\alpha_m} \rightarrow v_{1,n}^*$ and $v_{2,n}^{\alpha_m} \rightarrow v_{2,n}^*$ as $\alpha_m \rightarrow 0$, for some $(v_{1,n}^*, v_{2,n}^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. The first part of the proof now follows by letting $\alpha_m \rightarrow 0$ in (4.8).

Let $Y(t)$ be the process corresponding to $(v_1, v_{2,n}^*)$ with initial condition $i \in S$. Then using Itô-Dynkin's formula and (4.5), we get

$$E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T (r_1^n(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) - \rho_{1n}^*) ds} \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(Y(T)) \right] - \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) \geq 0.$$

Note that by Lemma 4.5, $\hat{\psi}_{1n}^*$ is bounded, which implies

$$\hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) \leq K(n) E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T (r_1^n(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) - \rho_{1n}^*) ds} \right],$$

where

$$K(n) = \max \left\{ \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(j), 1 + \max_{j=1, \dots, n} W(j) \right\}.$$

Taking logarithm, dividing by $\theta_1 T$ and by letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$\rho_{1n}^* \leq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_1 T} \ln E_i^{v_1, v_{2,n}^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1^n(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_{2,n}^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right].$$

Since $\theta_1 r_1^n \leq \theta_1 r_1 \leq \delta$, it follows that $0 \leq \rho_{1n}^* \leq \delta$. Similarly we can show that $0 \leq \rho_{2n}^* \leq \delta$. Therefore we have $\sup_n \{\rho_{1n}^*, \rho_{2n}^*\} \leq \delta$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Finally we prove that the coupled HJB equations described in Section 2 have suitable solutions which in turn leads to the existence of a Nash equilibrium in stationary strategies.

Theorem 4.5. *Assume (A1), (A3) and (A4). Then there exist a pair of stationary Markov strategies (v_1^*, v_2^*) , a pair of scalars (ρ_1^*, ρ_2^*) and a pair of functions $(\hat{\psi}_1^*(i), \hat{\psi}_2^*(i))$ in $B_W(S) \times B_W(S)$ such that*

$$(4.9) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta_1 \rho_1^* \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) = \inf_{v_1 \in V_1} \left[\Pi_{v_1, v_2^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1, v_2^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) + \theta_1 r_1(i, v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \\ \hat{\psi}_1^*(i_0) = 1, \\ \theta_2 \rho_2^* \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) = \inf_{v_2 \in V_2} \left[\Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2} \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1^*(i), v_2) \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) \right] \\ \quad = \Pi_{v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)} \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) + \theta_2 r_2(i, v_1^*(i), v_2^*(i)) \hat{\psi}_2^*(i) \\ \hat{\psi}_2^*(i_0) = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Furthermore the pair of stationary Markov strategies (v_1^*, v_2^*) is a Nash equilibrium and (ρ_1^*, ρ_2^*) is the corresponding Nash values.

Proof. By Theorem 4.4, we have a pair of stationary Markov strategies $(v_{1,n}^*, v_{2,n}^*)$, a pair of scalars $(\rho_{1n}^*, \rho_{2n}^*)$ and a pair of functions $(\hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i), \hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i))$ in $B_W(S) \times B_W(S)$ satisfy the coupled HJB equations (4.5). Therefore by a diagonalization argument, along a suitable subsequence $\hat{\psi}_{1n}^*(i) \rightarrow \hat{\psi}_1^*(i)$ and $\hat{\psi}_{2n}^*(i) \rightarrow \hat{\psi}_2^*(i)$, $i \in S$ for $(\hat{\psi}_1^*, \hat{\psi}_2^*) \in B_W(S) \times B_W(S)$.

Since $\mathcal{S}_1$ and $\mathcal{S}_2$ are compact, therefore along a subsequence denoted by the same subsequence, we have $v_{1,n}^* \rightarrow v_1^*$ and $v_{2,n}^* \rightarrow v_2^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$.

Note that by Theorem 4.4, $\sup_n \{\rho_{1n}^*, \rho_{2n}^*\} \leq \delta$, therefore along a subsequence denoted by the same subsequence, we have $\rho_{1n}^* \rightarrow \rho_1^*$ and $\rho_{2n}^* \rightarrow \rho_2^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The first part of the proof now follows by letting $n \rightarrow \infty$ in (4.5).

Let $Y(t)$ be the process corresponding to (v_1, v_2^*) with initial condition $i \in S$. Then using (4.9) and Itô-Dynkin's formula, see, Guo and Hernández-Lerma [[15], Appendix C, pp. 218-219] (Note that the condition C.3 and C.4 satisfy under condition (A3) from [[15], Lemma 6.3, pp. 90-91]), we obtain

$$\hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \leq E_i^{v_1, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T (r_1(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) - \rho_1^*) ds} \hat{\psi}_1^*(Y(T)) \right].$$

It follows from Lemma 4.4 that $\hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \leq W(i)$, for all $i \in S$. Hence

$$\hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \leq e^{-\theta_1 \rho_1^* T} E_i^{v_1, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) ds} W(Y(T)) \right].$$

From Lemma 4.3, we get

$$\hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \leq e^{-\theta_1 \rho_1^* T} (W(i) + bT) E_i^{v_1, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right].$$

Taking logarithm on both side we obtain

$$\ln \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \leq -\theta_1 \rho_1^* T + \ln(W(i) + bT) + \ln E_i^{v_1, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right].$$

Now dividing by $\theta_1 T$ and by letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\rho_1^* \leq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_1 T} \ln E_i^{v_1, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(s-), v_1(s, Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right], \quad v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

Let $v_1^* \in \mathcal{S}_1$ be a minimizing selector in (4.9) and let $Y(t)$ be the continuous time Markov chain corresponding to $(v_1^*, v_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ with initial condition i . Then using (4.9) and Itô-Dynkin's formula, we get

$$E_i^{v_1^*, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T (r_1(Y(s-), v_1^*(Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) - \rho_1^*) ds} \hat{\psi}_1^*(Y(T)) \right] - \hat{\psi}_1^*(i) = 0.$$

Since $\hat{\psi}$ is bounded below by Lemma 4.6, we have

$$\hat{\psi}_1^*(i) \geq K E_i^{v_1^*, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T (r_1(Y(s-), v_1^*(Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) - \rho_1^*) ds} \right],$$

where

$$K = \frac{1}{W(i_0)} \wedge \min_{i \in C_0^c} \{\hat{\psi}_1^*(i)\}.$$

Taking logarithm, dividing by $\theta_1 T$ and by letting $T \rightarrow \infty$, we get

$$\rho_1^* \geq \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\theta_1 T} \ln E_i^{v_1^*, v_2^*} \left[e^{\theta_1 \int_0^T r_1(Y(s-), v_1^*(Y(s-)), v_2^*(Y(s-))) ds} \right].$$

Therefore

$$\rho_1^* = \rho_1^{v_1^*, v_2^*} \leq \rho_1^{v_1, v_2^*} \quad \forall v_1 \in \mathcal{M}_1.$$

Using analogous argument we can show that

$$\rho_2^* = \rho_2^{v_1^*, v_2^*} \leq \rho_2^{v_1^*, v_2} \quad \forall v_2 \in \mathcal{M}_2.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Remark 4.1. Note that ρ_i^* , v_i^* , $i = 1, 2$, depend on θ_1 , θ_2 . As before we have suppressed this dependence for notational convenience.

5. CONCLUSION

We have established the existence of a pair of stationary strategies which constitutes a pair of Nash equilibrium strategies for risk sensitive stochastic games for continuous time Markov chain with ergodic cost. We have achieved these under a Lyapunov type stability assumption (A3) and a small cost condition (A4) which lead to the existence of suitable solution to the corresponding coupled HJB equations. The Lyapunov type of stability assumption is standard in literature (see, e.g., Guo and Hernández-Lerma [15]). The small cost assumption mean that the risk aversion parameter θ_k of player k must be small. For the discounted cost criterion we have established the existence of Nash equilibrium in Markov strategies under an additive structure (A2). It will be interesting to investigate if (A2) can be dropped to achieve the same result.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

The work of the first named author is supported in part by UGC Centre for Advanced Study. The work of the second named author is supported in part by the DST, India project no. SR/S4/MS:751/12. The work of the third named author is supported in part by Dr. D. S. Kothari postdoctoral fellowship of UGC.

REFERENCES

- [1] Basar, T. 1999. Nash equilibria of risk-sensitive nonlinear stochastic differential games. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **100** 479-498.
- [2] Bellman, R. 1957. *Dynamic programming*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.
- [3] Beneš, V. E. 1970. Existence of optimal strategies based on specified information, for a class of stochastic decision problems. *SIAM J. Control.* **8** 179-188.
- [4] Borkar, V. S., M. K. Ghosh. 1992. Stochastic differential games: occupation measure based approach. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **73(2)** 359-385. (Errata: 1996. *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* **88** 251-252.)
- [5] Cavazos-Cadena, R., E. Fernandez-Gaucherand. 1999. Controlled Markov chains with risk-sensitive criteria: average cost, optimality equations, and optimal solutions. *Math. Methods Oper. Res.* **49** 299-324.
- [6] Di Masi, G. B., L. Stettner. 1999. Risk-sensitive control of discrete-time Markov processes with infinite horizon. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **38(1)** 61-78.
- [7] Di Masi, G. B., L. Stettner. 2000. Infinite horizon risk sensitive control of discrete time Markov processes with small risk. *Systems Control Lett.* **40** 15-20.
- [8] Di Masi, G. B., L. Stettner. 2007. Infinite horizon risk-sensitive control of discrete time Markov processes under minorization property. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **46(1)** 231-252.
- [9] El-Karoui, N., S. Hamadene. 2003. BSDE and risk-sensitive control, zero-sum and nonzero-sum game problems of stochastic functional differential equations. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **107** 145-169.
- [10] Fan, K. 1952. Fixed-point and minimax theorems in locally convex topological linear spaces. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sc.* **38** 121-126.
- [11] Fleming, W. H., D. Hernández-Hernández. 1997. Risk-sensitive control of finite state machines on an infinite horizon I, *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **35(5)** 1790-1810.

- [12] Fleming, W. H., D. Hernández-Hernández. 2011. On the value of stochastic differential games. *Commun. Stoch. Anal.* **5** 341-351.
- [13] Fleming, W. H., W. M. McEneaney. 1995. Risk-sensitive control on an infinite-time horizon. *SIAM J. Control Optim.* **33(6)** 1881-1915.
- [14] Ghosh, M. K., S. Saha. 2014. Risk-sensitive control of continuous time Markov chain. *Stochastics*. **86** 655-675.
- [15] Guo, X., O. Hernández-Lerma. 2009. *Continuous time Markov decision processes*, Stochastic modelling and applied probability 62, Springer, Berlin.
- [16] Guo, X., O. Hernández-Lerma. 2005. Nonzero-sum games for continuous-time Markov chains with unbounded discounted payoffs. *J. Appl. Probab.* **42(2)** 303-320.
- [17] Guo, X., O. Hernández-Lerma. 2003. Zero-sum games for continuous-time Markov chains with unbounded transition and average payoff rates. *J. Appl. Probab.* **40(2)** 327-345.
- [18] Guo, X., O. Hernández-Lerma. 2007. Zero-sum games for continuous-time jump Markov processes in Polish spaces: discounted payoffs. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **39(3)** 645-668.
- [19] Hernández-Hernández, D., S. I. Marcus. 1996. Risk-sensitive control of Markov processes in countable state space. *Systems & Control Letters*. **29** 147-155.
- [20] Hernández-Hernández, D., S. I. Marcus. 1998. Risk-sensitive control of Markov processes in countable state space. *Systems & Control Letters*. **34(1-2)** 105-106 (Errata corriege).
- [21] Himmelberg, C. J., T. Parthasarathy, T. E. S. Raghavan and F. S. Van Vleck. 1976. Existence of p-equilibrium and optimal stationary strategies in stochastic games. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **60** 245-251.
- [22] Howard, R. A., J. E. Matheson. 1972. Risk-sensitive Markov decision processes. *Manag. Sci.* **8** 356-369.
- [23] Jacobson, D. H. 1973. Optimal stochastic linear systems with exponential performance criteria and their relation to deterministic differential games. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*. **AC-18** 124-131.
- [24] James, M. R., J. S. Baras, R. J. Elliott. 1994. Risk-sensitive control and dynamic games for partially observed discrete-time nonlinear systems, *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*. **39(4)** 780-792.
- [25] Klompstra, M. B. 2000. Nash equilibria in risk-sensitive dynamic games. *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*. **45(7)** 1397-1401.
- [26] Kumar, K. S., C. Pal. 2013. Risk-Sensitive control of pure jump process on countable space with near monotone cost. *Appl. Math. Optim.* **68(3)** 311-331.
- [27] Kumar, K. S., C. Pal. 2015. Risk-Sensitive ergodic control of continuous time Markov processes with denumerable state space. *Stoch. Anal. Appl.* **33(5)** 863-881.
- [28] Rothblum, U. G. 1984. Multiplicative Markov decision chains. *Math. Oper. Res.* **9** 6-24.
- [29] Warga, J. 1967. Functions of relaxed controls. *SIAM J. Control.* **5** 628-641.
- [30] Whittle, P. 1990. *Risk-sensitive optimal control*, Wiley-Interscience Series in Systems and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Chichester.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, BANGALORE -560012, INDIA.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY BOMBAY, MUMBAI - 400076, INDIA.

E-mail address: mkg@math.iisc.ernet.in, suresh@math.iitb.ac.in, chandan14@math.iisc.ernet.in